Mississippi

Reading Grade 4

1. Improvement Over Time




Have Mississippi's 4th graders improved in reading achievement?

Yes. The percentage of Mississippi's public school 4th graders who met the Goals Panel's performance standard in reading increased from 14% in 1992, to 18% in 1998.

The Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement - Proficient or Advanced - on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, or NAEP.

Percentage of public school 4th graders at or above Proficient on the NAEP reading assessment



Reading performance will be tested again in 2002.

2. State Comparisons[†]

How did Mississippi compare with other states in 4th grade reading achievement in public schools in 1998?

34 states had significantly higher percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

Connecticut	46%	Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri,	29%
New Hampshire	38%	New York, Texas, Washington,	
Massachusetts, Montana	37%	West Virginia	
Maine, Minnesota	36%	Michigan, North Carolina, Oregon,	28%
lowa	35%	Utah	
Colorado, Kansas, Wisconsin	34%	Delaware, Tennessee	25%
Rhode Island	32%	Alabama, Georgia	24%
U.S.*	31%	Arkansas, Florida	23%
Oklahoma, Virginia, Wyoming	30%	Arizona, New Mexico, South Carolina	22%

4 states had similar percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:


Nevada	21%	Mississippi	18 %
California	20%	Hawaii	17%
Louisiana	19%		

2 states had significantly lower¹ percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

District of Columbia 10% Virgin Islands 8%

3. Subgroup Performance

What percentages of public school 4th graders in different subgroups¹ in Mississippi were at or above Proficient on the 1998 NAEP reading assessment?



¹ Interpret differences between subgroups with caution. See pp. 2-3 and Appendix D.

⁺ The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories.

¹ See explanation on pp. 2-3.

^{*} Figure shown for the U.S. includes both public and nonpublic school data.

² Characteristics of the sample do not permit a reliable estimate.

³ No data reported for 4th graders by parents' highest level of education in 1998.

Mississippi

1. Improvement Over Time

Have Mississippi's 8th graders improved in reading achievement?

In 1998, 19% of Mississippi's public school 8th graders met the Goals Panel's performance standard in reading. Improvement over time will be reported when reading is assessed again in 2002.

The Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement — Proficient or Advanced — on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, or NAEP.

Percentage of public school 8th graders at or above Proficient on the NAEP reading assessment



Reading performance will be tested again in 2002.

2. State Comparisons⁺

How did Mississippi compare with other states in 8th grade reading achievement in public schools in 1998?

30 states had significantly higher¹ percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

Connecticut, Maine	42%	Colorado, Rhode Island	30%
Montana	38%	Kentucky, Missouri, Oklahoma,	29%
Minnesota	37%	Wyoming	
Massachusetts	36%	Arizona, Texas	28%
Kansas	35%	West Virginia	27%
New York	34%	Tennessee	26%
U.S.,* Oregon, Virginia, Wisconsin	33 %	Delaware, Georgia	25%
Washington	32%	Nevada, New Mexico	24%
Maryland, North Carolina, Utah	31%	Arkansas, Florida	23%

5 states had similar percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

California, South Carolina	22%	Mississippi, Hawaii	19 %
Alabama	21%	Louisiana	18%


2 states had significantly lower¹ percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

District of Columbia 12% Virgin Islands 10%

[†] The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories.

3. Subgroup Performance

What percentages of public school 8th graders in different subgroups in Mississippi were at or above Proficient on the 1998 NAEP reading assessment?



¹ Interpret differences between subgroups with caution. See pp. 2-3 and Appendix D.

¹ See explanation on pp. 2-3.

^{*} Figure shown for the U.S. includes both public and nonpublic school data.

²Characteristics of the sample do not permit a reliable estimate.